

### Remarks

Claims 1 - 8 and 12 - 14 remain in the application. This transmittal is presented in response to the sixth office action and is believed to completely resolve each issue as raised by the examiner. Applicant believes the claims to be non-obvious and patentably distinct from all prior art.

#### OA Item #1: Drawings objected to under 37 CFR § 1.83(a):

The examiner has objected to the drawings stating that, “the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims” and that “Therefore, the “triple blade” squeegee must be shown”. Although the examiner has noted that the squeegee is #103, the examiner argues that, “it fails to disclose the orientation of the blades”. The applicants respectfully point out that as noted by the examiner, the triple blade squeegee is shown in the drawings and is identified as #103. Further, in the specification, applicants specifically define the squeegee as a “triple blade” squeegee (see page 3, paragraph 0057, lines 18 and 9 in the specification). With respect to the orientation of squeegee, claim 1 defines the squeegee as being, “behind said first scrubber and in front of said buffer”. There is no further squeegee orientation defined in the claims. Accordingly, applicants respectfully suggest that applicants have complied with the requirements of 37 CFR § 1.83(a). Applicants therefore respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

#### OA Item #2: Claims Rejection under 35 USC § 103(a) - Obviousness:

The examiner has rejected claims 1 - 8 and 12 - 14 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Thatcher et al., in view of Nagayama et al., Warren et al., Thomas, Sr. et al., Katt and Wulff. However, applicant respectfully asserts that it is the unique combination of buffers, scrubbers, squeegee, and related components as defined in applicant’s application that provide advantages over machines of the cited prior art. Applicant further respectfully asserts that applicant’s application provides simultaneous scrubbing and buffing with improved waste water collection that is not found or taught by the cited prior art alone or in combination. Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

**Conclusion:**

Applicant submits that the arguments presented herein have established that the drawings do not need to be amended and that the claims are in condition for allowance. Action in accordance therewith is earnestly solicited.

If the examiner has any questions or comments which may be resolved over the telephone, she is requested to call Michael R. Schramm at 801-625-9268 or at 801-710-7793.

DATE: January 28, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael R. Schramm". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Michael R. Schramm

Reg. No. 56,441

Agent for the Applicants